REMARKS

Claim Amendments

Claims 1, 24 and 30 have been amended to replace the reference to metabolites and prodrugs of formula I with oxidized derivatives and esters of interest. Support for this amendment is found on page 21, lines 12-16 and page 20, lines 16-20.

Claims 13 and 15 have been amended to recite the specific cancers disclosed on pages 41-43 of the specification. Claims 14, 18, 19 and 21 directed to treating hyperproliferative disorders, abnormal angiogenesis and disease combinations have been canceled.

These amendments render moot the reasons for the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, first and second paragraphs, set forth on pages 2-8 of the Office Action.

Applicants traverse the rejection of claims 1-11 and 13-30 under 35 U.S.C.§112, first paragraph, based on the allegation that the specification is not enabling for compounds of formula I where B is napthyl or pyridinyl (Embodiments where B = quinolinyl have been deleted). It is further alleged that it would be undue experimentation to synthesize these compounds and then subject these compounds to Applicants raf-1 biochemical assay.

Applicants have shown by reference to other copending applications that the synthesis of compounds where "B" is other than phenyl would not require undue experimentation.

The 35 + compounds described in copending applications (discussed in the previous response) where "B" is pyridyl demonstrates that the technique for providing such a moiety in a urea compound was well known. Similarly, the following publications and patents describe methods for preparing ureas where "B" is naphthyl: WO 00/55152, WO 00/55139, WO 02/083628, U.S. 6,297,381 and U.S. 6,525,046. The state of the art was such that one skilled in the art could prepare compounds of formula I where "B" is not phenyl without undue experimentation.

The Examiner notes that the compounds illustrated in the copending applications have distinct moieties (isoxazoles) for "A".

As disclosed in the specification, the compounds of this invention can be synthesized in a number of ways including reacting an amine group on moiety "B" with a carbonyl group on moiety "A" to form a urea. It would be routine for one

skilled in the art to incorporate a moiety "A" consistent with this invention in a urea compound instead of an isoxazole by selecting the appropriate starting materials.

The copending applications which describe urea compounds where "B" is pyridyl, also demonstrate that this moiety can be present in compounds that exhibit raf kinase inhibiting activity. The disclosure within these copending applications rebut the Examiner's assumption that the pyridyl moiety will negatively impact raf kinase inhibition and provide a reasonable basis that those compounds where "B" is pyridyl or naphthyl will share the same biological properties as compound where "B" is phenyl.

The Applicants have provided effective assays to assess raf inhibiting the activity of these compounds. To perform such assays is routine in the field and would not require undue experimentations to perform.

For the reasons stated above, Applicants maintain that they have provide more than adequate guidance and examples to enable the claimed invention and submit all claims meet the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112, first and second paragraphs.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees associated with this response or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 13-3402.

Respectfully submitted,

/Richard J. Traverso/

Richard J. Traverso, Reg. No. 30,595
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)

MILLEN, WHITE, ZELANO
& BRANIGAN, P.C.
Arlington Courthouse Plaza 1, Suite 1400
2200 Clarendon Boulevard
Arlington, Virginia 22201
Telephone: (703) 243-6333
Facsimile: (703) 243-6410
Attorney Docket No.: BAYER-0044
Date: April 15, 2008